UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/551,786	04/18/2000	Jarkko Sevanto	460-009376-US(PAR)	2605

7590 09/12/2003

Clarence A Green
Perman & Green LLP
425 Post Road
Fairfield, CT 06430

EXAMINER	
NAJJAR, SALEH	
ART UNIT	**PAPER NUMBER**
2157	

DATE MAILED: 09/12/2003

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Office Action Summary	Application No.	Applicant(s)	
	09/551,786	SEVANTO ET AL.	
	Examiner	Art Unit	
	Saleh Najjar	2157	

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133).
- Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

1)☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on *19 June 2003* .

2a)☐ This action is **FINAL**. 2b)☒ This action is non-final.

3)☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

4)☒ Claim(s) *1-19* is/are pending in the application.

4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.

5)☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.

6)☒ Claim(s) *1-19* is/are rejected.

7)☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.

8)☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

9)☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.

10)☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a)☐ accepted or b)☐ objected to by the Examiner.

Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).

11)☐ The proposed drawing correction filed on _____ is: a)☐ approved b)☐ disapproved by the Examiner.

If approved, corrected drawings are required in reply to this Office action.

12)☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. §§ 119 and 120

13)☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).

a)☐ All b)☐ Some * c)☐ None of:

1.☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.

2.☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____ .

3.☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

14)☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for domestic priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(e) (to a provisional application).

a) ☐ The translation of the foreign language provisional application has been received.

15)☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for domestic priority under 35 U.S.C. §§ 120 and/or 121.

Attachment(s)

1) ☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
3) ☐ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449) Paper No(s) _____ .
4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413) Paper No(s). _____ .
5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)
6) ☐ Other: .

1. This action is responsive to the amendment filed June 19, 2003. Claims 2 was amended. Claims 1-19 are pending.

2. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

> (a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negatived by the manner in which the invention was made.

3. Claims 1-2, 4-12, and 14-19 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Hasegawa et al., U.S. Patent No. 6,370,587 further in view of Schwartz et al., U.S. Patent No. 6,473,609.

Hasegawa teaches the invention substantially as claimed including a network interconnection device connecting different types of networks (see abstract).

As to claim 1, Hasegawa teaches a method for the transmission of messages in a communication system from a transmitting terminal (MS1) to a receiving terminal (RH, MS2), which communication system comprises at least a first communication network (NW1), a second communication network (NW2) and a multimedia message switching centre (MMSC), in which first communication network (NWI) at least a first address type is used as the terminal address and in which second communication network (NW2) at least a second address type is used as the terminal address, and in which system the address of the receiving terminal (RH, MS2) is annexed to said multimedia message, characterized in that the multimedia message is further supplemented with data on the type of said address, wherein the message is transmitted from the transmitting terminal (MS-L) to said message switching centre (MMSC), in which the type of the address of the receiving terminal (RH, MS2) is examined, and said address type is used to select the communication network (NWI, NW2) to be used in the transmission of the message from the message switching centre (MMSC) to the receiving terminal (RH, MS2) (see figs. 1-26; col. 5-10, Hasegawa discloses that different types of networks are

interconnected through an Internet and that message addresses are converted to the proper destination network address based on the type of destination network).

Hasegawa does not explicitly disclose Multimedia Messaging.

However, Schwartz teaches a mobile devices interacting with an Internetwork where multimedia messages are transmitted therebetween (see col. 2-14).

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to modify Hasegawa in view of Schwartz to specify Multimedia messages.

One of ordinary skill in the art would have been motivated to do so to process messages of different types such as text, video, etc.

As to claim 2, Hasegawa teaches the method according to claim 1.

Hasegawa fails to teach the limitation characterized in that the first communication network (NWI) used is a mobile communication network and the second communication network (NW2) used is the Inter-net data network.

However, Schwartz teaches a method and system for interactive two way communication between mobile devices and Internetworks (see abstract).

Schwartz teaches that the first communication network (NWI) used is a mobile communication network and the second communication network (NW2) used is the Inter-net data network (see figs. 1-9; col. 6-20).

It would have been obvious to on of ordinary skill in the art att he time of the invention to modify Hasegawa in view of Schwartz to specify a mobile network. One would be motivated to do so to allow handheld and wireless devices to communicate with the Internet.

As to claim 4, Hasegawa teaches the method according to claim 2, characterized in that in the first communication network (NW1), messages are transmitted by using a first communication protocol, and in the second communication network (NW2), multimedia messages are transmitted by using a second communication protocol, and that the format of the data on the type of the address to be annexed to the multimedia message is independent of said communication protocols for multimedia messages (see col. 5-18).

As to claim 5, Hasegawa teaches the method according to claim 1, characterized in that the multimedia message is transmitted to two or more receivers, wherein the message is supplemented with the address of the terminal (RH, MS2) of each receiver, as well as data on the type of each address (see col. 6-18).

As to claim 6, Hasegawa teaches the method according to claim 1.

Hasegawa fails to teach the limitation characterized in that the communication system is provided with a multimedia Messaging service transfer protocol (MMTP), wherein multimedia messages to be transmitted from the transmitting terminal (MSI) to the multimedia message switching centre (MMSC) are converted into messages complying with said multimedia Messaging service transfer protocol (MMTP).

However, Schwartz teaches a method and system for two way wireless devices to interact with the Internet (see abstract). Schwartz teaches the limitation characterized in that the communication system is provided with a multimedia Messaging service transfer protocol (MMTP), wherein multimedia messages to be transmitted from the transmitting terminal (MSI) to the multimedia message switching centre (MMSC) are converted into messages complying with said multimedia Messaging service transfer protocol (MMTP) (see col. 10).

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to modify Hasegawa in view of Schwartz to implement MMTP protocol.

One would be motivated to do so to allow human-computer interaction involving text, graphics, voice and video.

As to claim 7, Hasegawa teaches method according to claim 1.

Hasegawa does not explicitly teach the limitation characterized in that said data on the address type is given in text format.

However, Schwartz teaches the limitation characterized in that said data on the address type is given in text format (see col. 15).

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to modify Hasegawa in view of Schwartz to implement text format addressing. One would be motivated to do so to allow addresses that are easily remembered by client users.

As to claim 8, Hasegawa teaches the method according to claim 1.

Hasegawa fails to teach the limitation characterized in that said data on the address type is given as a hexadecimal character string.

However, Hexadecimal address format is old and well known in the art. It would have been obvious to on of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to modify Hasegawa by implementing Hexadecimal address format. One would be motivated to do so since Hexadecimal is more succinct than binary for representing bit-masks, machines addresses, and other low-level constants.

As to claim 9, Hasegawa teaches the method according to claim 1, characterized in that said data on the address type is given as a binary number (see col. 7-12).

As to claim 10, Hasegawa teaches the method according to claim 1, characterized in that in the method, two or more formats are used in the address and the address type data of said receiving terminal (RH, MS2), wherein in the method the multimedia message is also supplemented with data on the format used in the address and the address type data (see col. 6-13).

Claims 11-12, and 14-19 do not teach or define any new limitations above claims 1-2, 4-10 and therefore are rejected for similar reasons.

4. Claims 3, and 13 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Hasegawa et al., U.S. Patent No. 6,370,587 further in view of Schwartz et al., U.S. Patent No. 6,473,609 further in view of Eldridge et al., U.S. Patent No. 6,487,189.

Hasegawa teaches the invention substantially as claimed including a network interconnection device connecting different types of networks (see abstract).

As to claim 3, Hasegawa teaches method according to claim 2.

Hasegawa fails to teach the limitation characterized in that the second address type is an SMTP address.

However, Eldridge teaches a system where the destination uses an email address (see col. 6).

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to modify Hasegawa by enabling routing based on e-mail address. One would be motivated to do so since e-mail addresses are easy to remember address.

Claims 13 does not teach or define any new limitation above claim 3 and therefore is rejected for similar reasons.

5. Applicant's arguments with respect to claims 1-19 filed on June 19, 2003 are moot in view of the new grounds of rejection.

6. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Saleh Najjar whose telephone number is (703) 308-7613. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday-Friday from 6:30 to 3:00.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, *Ario Etienne*, can be reached on (703) 308-7562.

Any inquiry of a general nature or relating to the status of this application or proceeding should be directed to the Group receptionist whose telephone number is (703) 305-9600. The central official fax nuamber for the group is (703) 872-9306.

Saleh Najjar
Primary Examiner / Art Unit 2157